

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending application No. 11/794,217. Submitted concurrently herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer to obviate this rejection.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 7-9, 11-16, and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner indicated that the limitation “the high boiling fraction (v)” in line 1 of step (d) did not have an antecedent basis. By this paper, claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1-3, 7-8, 14, 16, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Germaine (US2004/0045868). Applicants submit that this rejection is now moot in view of the amendments that have been made to claim 1.

In the Office Action, claims 9, 11-13 and 22 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. By this paper, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1, and all claims depending therefrom are now in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner find any impediment to the prompt allowance of this case which could be corrected by telephone interview with the undersigned, the Examiner is requested to initiate such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

NICHOLAS J. ADAMS and
MICHEL CRAMWINCKEL

By /Craig M. Lundell/
Their Attorney, Craig M. Lundell
Registration No. 30,284
(713) 241-2475

P. O. Box 2463
Houston, Texas 77252-2463